



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,797	11/07/2001	Nobuaki Ohara	IIDAP20.001C1	1840
20995	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			MORILLO, JANELL COMBS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/007,797	OHARA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Janelle Combs-Morillo	1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4,7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 4,7 and 8 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bose (US 5,407,124).

Bose teaches a method of brazing using an Al-Si-Cu-Zn alloy filler (abstract, etc) with a liquidus from 499-521 °C and a solidus from 471-493 °C (column 2 lines 53-56) that is suitable to braze alloys with a solidus 510-582 °C (column 3 lines 6-9). The examiner asserts that it is known to braze articles below their solidus temperature, and therefore it is within the disclosure of Bose to braze at temperatures  $\leq$  582 °C. Bose does not teach the highest temperature reached in brazing is  $\geq$  40 °C over the liquidus temperature of the brazing filler.

However, changes in temperature, concentrations, or other process conditions of an old process does not impart patentability unless the recited ranges are critical, i.e. they produce a new and unexpected result. However, said parameter must first be recognized as a result-effective variable, i.e., a variable which achieves a recognized result, before the determination of the optimum or workable ranges of said variable might be characterized as routine experimentation. *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 195 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1977), See also *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Because the parameter of brazing temperature (which must be between the liquidus temperature of the filler and the solidus temperature of the article to be brazed) is a result effective variable, wherein the recognized result is a completely

fluid filler (column 4 lines 26-27), then the determination of the optimum or workable ranges of said variable are characterized as routine experimentation.

Therefore it is held that Bose has created a *prima facie* case of obviousness of the presently claimed invention.

Concerning dependent claim 2, it is held to be within the disclosure of Bose to ramp up to the brazing temperature, which would meet the instant limitation of “elevation of the temperature after exceeding the liquidus temperature”.

Concerning dependent claim 3, Bose teaches that said brazing method can take place in a vacuum furnace with or without the use of a flux.

***Response to Amendment***

3. In the response filed on February 23, 2004, applicant amended claims 1 and 4, cancelled claims 5-6, and added new claims 7 and 8. The examiner agrees that no new matter has been added.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 7, and 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 4, 7, and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not teach or suggest the presently claimed method of brazing, complete with the

instant liquidus, solidus, and brazing temperature limitations, as well as the instant filler alloy compositional ranges.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janelle Combs-Morillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-1240. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.



GEORGE WYSZOMIERSKI  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

JCM   
May 14, 2004